

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-4, 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Surve (US 6,591,008) in view of Fink (New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia, vol. 4, issue 1, 1998) and further in view of Carro (US 7,316,566).

Claim 18 is directed to adapting presentation contents to a user with perceptibility impairment including low vision. In a typical adaptation scenario, a system receives some information about the type of user impairment (as in unit 200 of the applicant's Fig. 1, or in section 2 of Fink), and performs adaptation based on such information. Such adaptation however may require significant computer resources, and in some embodiments of claim 18 the type of information in the applicant's unit 200 is designed to optimize the use of computer resources. While claim 18 is not limited to the unit 200 and other embodiments discussed herein, claim 18 recites a unique kind of a "presentation priority" for adaptation. More particularly, claim 18 recites:

- (line 4): "a presentation priority for each modality of a plurality of first modalities";

- (lines 11-13): "adapting the object in accordance with the first modality's presentation priority to obtain an adapted object whose modality is unchanged but whose presentation quality is enhanced or not in accordance with the first modality's presentation priority".

Thus, according to claim 18, there is a "presentation priority" which:

(1) is associated with a modality; and

(2) provides for enhancement without changing the modality.

In some embodiments, a presentation priority satisfying the conditions (1) and (2) optimizes use of computer resources, and consequently improves the presentation quality, as described in the applicant's specification at page 16 lines 1-12 ("when a low-vision user is interested in text contents, the text ... will be enhanced, audio contents may be enhanced as well (if the user has no problem in hearing), while the image contents may be ... given in

low quality... Specifically, objects of high priorities will be enhanced and allocated more resources which results in higher qualities").

Claim 18 is not limited to the embodiments discussed herein.

In contrast to the applicant's presentation priority, Fink's priority is used to determine which modality is preferable over other modalities in order to perform modality conversion, i.e. change of modality. Therefore, Fink's priority does not satisfy the applicant's condition (2). Note Fink's page 6 lines 1-3 and page 3 lines 3-4 ("For blind users, the modality ... must be changed to tactile and/or audio output").

The office action states at the bottom of page 2 ("Response to Arguments"):

Fink discloses adaptation of object with the first modality's presentation priority without changing modality (...pp. 13-14). So, Fink teaches the priority of text over image modality...

This is not understood. If Fink teaches "priority of text over image modality", then Fink teaches changing image to text modality, not enhancement "without changing modality". Indeed, on pages 13-14 (starting the last paragraph on page 13), Fink teaches replacing image with textual description.

The office action page 3 states that "the combination of Fink and Carro enhances text modality". The applicant agrees. In fact, Carro alone enhances text modality as well as all other modalities on a screen (Carro's enhancement is not based on a modality, and Carro does not teach a presentation priority based on a modality). However, Fink's presentation priority does not satisfy the applicant's condition (2). The combination of Fink and Carro will not result in an enhancement guided by the presentation priority of (1) and (2).

Surve is directed to colors and is not concerned with modalities, and does not overcome the Fink's and Carro's deficiency.

The applicant thanks the examiner in advance for consideration of this response. The examiner is welcomed to telephone the undersigned at the number below to facilitate resolution of any issues regarding this case.

If a fee is required for this submission, please charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to deposit account 08-1394.

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's electronic filing system on February 3, 2011.

Signature:

Michael Shenker

Date:

03 Feb. 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Shenker

Michael Shenker
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 34,250
Telephone: (408) 660-4157

Law Offices Of
Haynes and Boone, LLP